DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 081 678 SO 006 103

AUTHOR	Brown, Don A.; And Others
TITLE	The "I" Team Project: A Final Report. (An ESEA Title III Project.)
INSTITUTION	Cherry Creek High School, Englewood, Colo.
PUB DATE	Jul 72
NOTE	86p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Alternative Schools; *Basic Skills; Behavior Change; Changing Attitudes; Diagnostic Teaching; Educational Programs; Evaluation Methods; Individualized Programs; *Low Achievers; Motivation Techniques; Questionnaires; Secondary Education: *Student Centered Curriculum; Student School Relationship; Summative Evaluation; Surveys; Test Results; Work Experience
IDENTIFIERS	Elementary Secondary Education Act Title III; ESEA Title III; Minicourses

ABSTRACT

This final report of the "I" Project for 1971-72 evaluates the general objectives of providing a responsive educational program for students who do not respond to usual secondary programs. The program was to be a model for creating positive attitude, behavior and skill changes. A basic skills laboratory, diagnostic procedures, individualized reading and math programs, minicourses, work experience, and field experience were part of the student-centered approach. Formal and informal measures were used to evaluate objectives: standardized tests measured reading and math; surveys marked attitudinal and behavior change. Test findings indicated gains in both reading and math. A positive change was observed in attitude and behavior. This alternative to secondary education was considered successful; continuation with minor changes was suggested. The appendix includes a Budget Summary, Student Attitude Surveys, Parent Response Questionnaires, and test Results. (KSM)

ED 081678

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 081678

THE "I" TEAM PROJECT: A FINAL REPORT

(An ESEA Title III Project)

Submitted by:

Dr. Don A. Brown and Dr. Donald E. Carline,
"I" Project Evaluators,
and
Lyle O. Johnson, Project Director

to

Russell Polton, Acting Superintendent
and
The Board of Education, Cherry Creek Schools

July, 1972

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Introduction		i
I	Abstract	1
II	Context	3
III	Program	9
IV	Evaluation	25
Appendix		

INTRODUCTION

There is a twofold purpose for this report. First, it serves as an evaluation of the "I" Project for the 1971-72 school year to the Board of Education and the Acting Superintendent of Schools of the Cherry Creek School District. Secondly, it examines and recommends to the Board and Acting Superintendent performance remuneration for the staff of the "I" Project who were employed under a "performance contracting" arrangement as part of their 1971-72 working agreement.

The evaluation indicates the degree to which the objectives stated in the Continuation Proposal of 1971-72 have been fulfilled, and makes recommendations for the administration and program staff to consider for continuation and strengthening of the program concepts.

I believe you will find the evaluation comprehensive and complete. In a year where "performance contracting" by commercial enterprises was criticized heavily, Cherry Creek's in-district teacher contracting system justified the premise that "performance contracting" does have a place within the school district. It proved that "performance contracting" by teachers, with district approved criteria and objectives, can attain stated goals. Basically, above other more obvious attainments, it helped students "turn on" to learning and success oriented experiences which enabled them to make wise choices regarding their

futures. The staff worked diligently in their efforts to achieve their bonuses, and as their philosophy states..."the student comes first", they never lost sight of the student.

Dr. Brown and Dr. Carline are to be commended for their evaluation of the "I" Project. It succinctly points out that this program holds promise of continuing to meet the needs of educationally handicapped, undermotivated, potential dropouts, as well as moving in an important direction in individualizing instruction for secondary students.

Lyle Johnson,
Project Director

I. ABSTRACT

Chief Objectives. The general objective of the Project was to provide a more meaningful, responsive educational program for a group of students who do not respond to the secondary educational program available to them. The primary objectives are to create a model of a program which would be effective in creating positive change in the attitudes, behaviors, and skills of these students.

Setting. The "I" Team Project is located in the Cherry Creek School District, a suburban area just southeast of Denver, Colorado. The 11-12 group of approximately fifty (50) students is in a separate cottage facility off-campus. The 9-10 group of thirty (30) students are housed in the regular secondary school.

Program. During a pre-school workshop all students are pre-tested and a program is prescribed for them individually. The Project consists of a basic skills laboratory utilizing a completely individualized program of math and reading instruction, minicourses for academic areas, work experience, and field experience. It is a student-centered approach which emphasized the personal counseling and guidance of all staff members with the students.

Program Evaluation. The attainment of fourteen (14) specific objectives is measured by both formal and informal measures. Standardized tests of reading and math are complemented by measures created to measure attitudinal and behavioral change.

Results. Test findings indicate reading gains of 2.4 years and math gains of 1.5 years in one year's time. Eighty-seven (87%) percent of the students made reading gains of at least one year. Math gains of a year or more were made by seventy-three (73%) percent of the students. Various other measures indicate strong positive change in attitude and behavior as well as skills.

Conclusions and Recommendations. The evaluators concluded that the program was highly successful in providing a meaningful alternative route in secondary education. Recommendations included suggestions for continuation, minor change, and for dissemination of information on the Project.

II. CONTEXT

A. The Locale

Cherry Creek School District is located within the greater Metropolitan Denver area. Situated on the high plains immediately adjacent to the eastern range of the Rocky Mountains, the Denver Metropolitan area is the largest population center between the Missouri River and the Pacific Coast. Cherry Creek covers 114 square miles in Arapahoe County and serves all or part of the incorporated areas of Cherry Hills Village, Greenwood Village, Glendale, Englewood, Aurora, and many new unincorporated residential developments, as well as a large rural area. Most areas are within twenty-five (25) minutes of downtown Denver.

The per pupil expenditures in Cherry Creek School District are consistently among the highest in Colorado, and the students tend to come from above average homes both in terms of education and income. Support for the school system was expressed when a bond issue was passed by approximately a 2:1 margin this Spring.

While most of the students in the "I" Team Project also come from educationally and financially advantaged homes, a significant number come from disadvantaged circumstances. Poverty, poor education, or the social disadvantage of broken homes is felt more bitterly when it is placed alongside contrasting situations. Poverty,

for example, which might go unnoticed in an Appalachian community, can be strongly resented by students competing with those from advantaged circumstances in Cherry Hills Village.

B. The School System

The Cherry Creek School District enrolled over 10,000 students K-12 during the 1971-1972 school year. The students are housed in modern facilities including nine elementary units (K-6); two middle schools (7-8); and a senior high school (9-12); plus special facilities for the mentally retarded and economically disadvantaged.

There are approximately 355 certified and 200 classified staff members. Small classes receive high priority, with the current average ratios not including administrators, consultants or special teachers are as follows: elementary, 25.2; middle school, 22; and senior high, 20.

The educational program in the Cherry Creek School District is supported financially with income from local county, state, and federal sources. The Capital Reserve and Bond, Interest, Budgets are supported solely by the local taxpayer in the form of a tax on real estate. The General Fund Budget, by far the largest of the budgets, is supported annually as follows: 67.68% from local taxes; 27.77% from state sources; and 4.55% from

federal sources (estimated for 1972). Each year, at its regular October meeting, the Board of Education adopts a budget in the above noted areas which determines expenditures for the coming year. These budgets are prepared during the previous nine months and reflect the estimated expenditures needed to carry on the District's educational program.

C. The "I" Team

The program operates on a "school is everywhere" concept, but with a central office-classroom located in a house type cottage behind one of the elementary schools. Thirty (30) students are housed on the campus of Cherry Creek Senior High School. Extensive use is also made of the outside classroom environment, such as in the mountains, in an Outward Bound setting, an auto shop in the paid world of work, and service type activities involving students in the community.

The Cottage School is a building of approximately 2,000 square feet, including a basement area. The basement area contains three separate classrooms, two of which are suitable for from eight to ten students and one suitable for from fifteen to eighteen students. In addition, there is a large lounge area which can be used for group meetings of up to thirty students. The main floor of the building is divided into an office area, which lends itself

to counseling and office work, and a basic skills laboratory large enough to accommodate approximately thirty students.

The 9-10 Program is housed in the Campus Upper Unit East building. The physical facilities include two rooms designed to accommodate thirty students most adequately. The arrangement of the classrooms are for varied activities and have both school-type furniture and casual furniture. The academic materials and equipment include those necessary for reading, mathematics, and social studies. In addition to this, a paperback library for all fields is included.

The rooms are accessible from two vantage points within the building, in fact, too accessible because of a student traffic disturbance. This is a constant annoyance because the rooms are located at the end of the hall to an outside exit of the building.

The "I" Team originated with a concern on the part of the teachers and administrators at Cherry Creek Senior High School for the educationally handicapped students who were unable to cope with the traditional school environment. The behavior of these students was typically negative, and was frequently expressed by inappropriate behavior within the classroom or by withdrawal from the school situation as "dropouts". Earmarks of these students often included poor attitudes, negative behaviors, and pronounced deficits in the basic skills of reading and math.

An exploratory program was begun in the Fall of 1969 emphasizing a counseling approach between teacher and student. The program reached 18 students and was funded by the Colorado State Department of Education as a Title III Project.

The evaluation at the end of the first year showed the students preferred somewhat more content, but the program had been successful in keeping students in school and creating a more positive attitude toward school.

The following year the school district launched a revised, enlarged and more structured program including a basic skills laboratory, minicourses, vocational education, field trips into the greater community, as well as counseling and guidance. The program was again funded by Colorado State Department under Title III. The final report of the project states:

> "...the "I" Team Project has been overwhelmingly successful in attaining its' goals. ...the effectiveness of the program cannot be denied."

In line with the continuation proposal, during the third year of the Project, the "I" Project staff chose to divide the cottage concept from the campus concept, thus formulating a 9-10 campus and an 11-12 cottage program off-campus. A stronger career education element has been added to the original (11-12) "I"

Team Project. It is this year's program with which this evaluation deals most directly.

III. PROGRAM

A. Scope of the Program

The general purpose of the "I" Team Project, as stated in its original proposal, is to "provide a more meaningful responsive educational program" for students who have not made a successful adjustment to traditional secondary education programs. It attempts to provide an alternate educational route to the rigid structure and unwieldy organization often found in the large traditional high school. Above all else the "I" Team focuses directly on the individual student and his needs for improvement in attitude, behavior, and skills.

The students selected for "I" Team generally did not like school, did not like their studies, and did not like their teachers. The usual structured program which required each student to study from the same text, in the same room, and at the same time as every other student in the room regardless of his individual needs or abilities had frustrated him. In the "I" Team the decision was made to individualize the instruction insofar as was possible. Each student was screened for the possibility of specific learning disabilities. Tests were given to determine the kind and degree of disability that each student might have. Instruction was prescribed on the basis of initial diagnostic and

placement tests shortly after the student entered "I" Team. This initial prescription served as a starting point and the instructors continued to adjust and prescribe instruction throughout the year.

In addition to basic skills improvement a strong counseling relationship was built into the program. Although student teachers have a basic responsibility for certain kinds of counseling, all members of the staff worked to develop a strong personal relationship with the student members of the "I" Team Project. Even the Director of the program, Mr. Lyle Johnson, kept a close personal contact with the students in the program.

Students also had the opportunity to contact the larger community through various field experiences. These were generally divided into three different categories: (1) community involvement with community action and community improvement programs; (2) contact with the environment in various areas of the state or the Metropolitan Denver area; and (3) the world of work in which each interested student had an opportunity to find and maintain a job in some field of productive labor.

Another part of the :"I" Team Project had been the use of minicourses rather than semester-long or year-long courses.

It is possible for a student to pick up a standard high school credit by combining various minicourses into the equivalent of a longer full year subject. It has provided flexibility in meeting the needs of students without outlasting their duration of interest.

In addition, the atmosphere of the "I" Team had proved to be different from that of the traditional high school even in such areas as physical education. Such experiences are less formal. The "teacher" often simply gathers students together for a game of softball. The students may come and go throughout the game, and although most take part, a few may drift to the sidelines and watch from the bleachers without needing special excuses.

Much of the instruction which takes place in "I" Team tends to be situational rather than structured, and informal instruction seems to be well capitalized upon. It is difficult to measure the effectiveness of such instruction except in rather global terms, but it is an obvious part of the "I" Team Program.

B. Personnel

"I" Team utilizes the services of nine professional personnel, a secretary, and two consultants. The success or failure

of the "I" Team rests with this staff. The mean age of the instructional staff is 25.5 years with a range in ages of 22-38. The youthfulness of the staff has been an advantage in many ways. Lack of experience necessitated "learning as they go", and threw additional responsibility on the Project Director, but each staff member maintained the ability to relate to students and to remain enthusiastic as well as patient. Greater interrelation of the Counselors and Field Experience Specialists with the Prescription Specialist would have been beneficial, more time for the Director to work with the 9-10 Project, more attention given to avoidance of student "constituencies" by some of the teachers; all would have made a stronger program, but with an average beginning experience of only 3.5 years (including one with eleven and another with twelve years), it would seem that the staff has done very well.

Following is a list of the instructional staff, with a description of their training and experience:

NAME/TITLE	AGE	DEGREES	MAJOR	YEAR	SCHOOL
Cuaron, Carlos Diagnosis and Prescription Specialist, Team Leader, 11-12 Project	35	B.S.	Biological Science	1961	University of Texas at El Paso
		M.A.	Major Learning Disabilities	1971	University of Denver
		Presently pursuing Doctoral studies at University of Denver			
		Experience:	10 years; Secondary Sciences; El Paso, Texas 1 year; (intern); "I" Team Project, Cherry Creek School District 1 year; Reading and Related Subjects; "I" Team Project, Cherry Creek Schools (1971-72)		
Keck, Bonnie Diagnosis and Prescription Specialist, Team Leader, 9-10 Project	24	B.A.	Social Studies	1970	University of Denver
		Pursuing M.A. in Learning Disabilities at University of Northern Colorado			
		Experience:	1 year; (teacher's aide); "I" Team Project, Cherry Creek Schools 1 year; teacher 9-10; "I" Team Project, Cherry Creek Schools (1971-72)		
Lee, Gordon E. Counselor, Field Experience Coordinator, 9-10 Project	38	B.S.	Sciences	1963	University of Houston
		40 hours plus above B.S. Degree in graduate studies			
		Experience:	1 year;Sciences; Thoka, Texas 6 years; Secondary Sciences; Houston, Texas 3 years; Sciences; Post, Texas 1 year; Reading and Related Subjects; "I" Team Project, Cherry Creek Schools (1971-72) (4 years was spent in personal business)		

NAME/TITLE	AGE	DEGREES	MAJOR	YEAR	SCHOOL
Reed, Richard Field Experience Specialist; 11-12 Project	29	B.A. Pursuing M.A. in Learning Disabilities at University of Denver Experience: 3 years; Special Education; Arapahoe High School, School District 6 (Littleton) 1 1/2 years; Special Subjects; "I" Team Project, Cherry Creek School District	Special Education	1967	Adams State College
Scannell, Jeryl Lee] Counselor, 11-12 Project	26	B.A. Pursuing M.A. in Learning Disabilities at University of Denver Experience: 2 years; Language Arts; Adams School District 50 (Westminster) 1 year; Language Arts and Related Subjects; "I" Team Project, Cherry Creek Schools (1971-72)	English	1968	Monmouth College, N.J.
INTERNS -- Gustafson, John Intern, 11-12 Project	24	B.A. Presently pursuing M.A. in Learning Disabilities at University of Denver Experience: 2 years; Social Studies and Related subjects; Detroit Public Schools (inner city schools) 1 year; (paid intern); Related Subjects; "I" Team Project, Cherry Creek Schools (1971-72)	Social Studies	1969	University of Michigan
Thompson, Steve Intern, 11-12 Project	24	B.A. Pursuing M.A. in History at University of Northern Colorado Experience: 1/2 year; (non-paid intern); Related Subjects; "I" Team Project, Cherry Creek Schools, (1971-72)	Social Studies	1971	Claremont

NAME/TITLE	AGE	DEGREE	MAJOR	YEAR	SCHOOL
Tursik, Steve Intern, 9-10 Project	22	B.A.	Psychology	1971	Fort Hayes Kansas State College
		Experience:	1/2 year; (teacher's aide); Related Subjects; "I" Team Project, Cherry Creek Schools, (1971-72)		
Youngs, Beth Intern, 11-12 Project	23	B.S.	Deaf Education	1969	Trinity University
		Presently pursuing M.A. at the University of Denver in Learning Disabilities			
		Experience:	2 years; Education of the Deaf; suburb of Dallas, Texas		
			1 year; intern; Related Subjects "I" Team, Cherry Creek Schools		
Johnson, Lyle Director, "I" Team Project	38	B.A.	Social Studies	1955	University of Denver
		M.A.	Guidance and Counseling; Psychology	1959	University of Denver
		Presently pursuing advanced graduate work beyond the Master's level			
		Experience:	1 year; Social Studies; Menlo Park, California		
			2 years; Social Studies, Grand Junction, Colo.		
			12 years; Social Studies, Special Education, Guidance and Counseling, and Administration; Arapahoe School District No. 6 (Littleton)		
			2 years; Counseling, Guidance, Psychology, and Administration; "I" Team Project, Cherry Creek Schools,		

Dr. Wallace Anderson has served as Psychological and Learning Disabilities Consultant to the Project for the past two and one-half years. He has worked with both the Director and the staff in understanding the remedial implications of various diagnoses and has presented student-by-student analyses for staff meetings. This has permitted the staff to become more thoroughly acquainted with the potential and abilities of each of the students, as well as plan suitable remedial programs.

Dr. Anderson is presently teaching at Denver University in Learning Disabilities and Psychology. He previously served as Staff Psychologist for Laradon Hall, a training center for mentally retarded young men and women, and is a consultant and evaluator to a number of United States Office of Education Title Programs across the country.

Another consultant, Dr. Don A. Brown, was hired in the areas of diagnosis and evaluation to assess the attainment of basic skills development and to evaluate the general project goals. He is presently a Professor of Education at the University of Northern Colorado, specializing in the area of reading education for disadvantaged and educationally handicapped high school, college, and adult students.

In addition, Dr. Donald E. Carline, of the University of Colorado, has served as an outside evaluator. Dr. Brown and Dr. Carline were appointed to prepare the final evaluative report on the "I" Team Project.

C. Procedures

Candidates for the "I" Team Project were recommnnded by counselors, teachers, parents, and present students of the "I" Team Project. Each candidate was counseled before he was admitted to the "I" Team and made aware of the aims of the Project. No student was admitted to "I" Team unless he made a personal commitment in terms of attendance and effort. One of the students interviewed in the course of the evaluation made the remark that she had underestimated the importance placed on attendance by members of the staff at "I" Team. She commented that when she was absent in the regular high school no one really seemed to care. She soon came to find that an absence at "I" Team was not allowed to go unnoticed. She commented, "In a way "I" Team is much stricter than high school because they really expect you to be here, and after you help plan the work you will be doing, the teachers really expect you to do it."

Before school actually began there was a diagnostic presession in which students were evaluated on the basis of their learning abilities and the level of their development in skill areas such as reading and math. The staff took the results and designed a prescription for each student in the program. This prescription was modified as the student developed new skills and knowledges. Most work within the basic skills lab and minicourses was handled on an individual

student-teacher contract basis in which the teacher and student planned activities together needed for growth in basic skills or knowledge. Greater effort was made this year not to interrupt minicourse or basic skills work by field experiences which might rupture learning efforts at a crucial point.

Primarily, the organization consisted of:

1. A basic skills laboratory in which the students worked to develop and improve reading, writing, and arithmetic skills. This was accomplished through highly individualized programs based on initial diagnosis followed by teaching and reassessment throughout the year,
2. Counseling on an informal basis which included virtually every member of the staff and all of the students in the program,
3. Extended field experiences, and
4. Extensive use of minicourses.

The physical location of the "I" Team Project was important to its functioning as was mentioned earlier. The cottage in which the 11-12 students met was in a location quite removed from the high school. This undoubtedly permitted greater freedom than would have been the case if it had been within the high school. Students are able to

retire to a downstairs lounge where they could get a coke or smoke and "unwind" at any time they felt the need.

The cottage facility had two upstairs rooms. One room was assigned to the staff, with desks arranged in open design where students were always able to come in and talk with a member of the staff. Even the Director's "office" was in a portion of the room partially shielded with utilitarian petitions such as book-cases and file drawers, but open to anyone who wanted to walk by, sit down and chat a moment. Coffee was kept available and an informal atmosphere prevailed in which it was possible for a student to come in and discuss anything about which he might be troubled.

The second room upstairs was the basic skills laboratory, which had a few audio-visual machines such as a controlled reader, two tape recorders, study carrels, a growing library, reading materials, paperbacks, and storage made for programmed math materials. Also central to the room was overstuffed furniture on which the student who needed to break away from the struc-tured setting of the carrels could take his book and sit and relax while he read. A coffee table provided interesting magazines and other reading materials for eyecatching, relaxed reading. This room also avoided the structured appearance of a traditional

classroom or even the traditional reading laboratory. The desk of the prescription specialist, Mr. Carlos Cuaron, or Beth Young, his assistant, did not have a commanding position in the room and was obviously a working area rather than the traditional desk from which one might authoritatively direct the activities of students within the laboratories.

The 9-10 program was located several miles away in the East building at the Upper Unit, where it shared facilities with the regular secondary school. It was placed in two rooms which were, unfortunately, located at the end of a very busy hall and adjacent to a busy outside exit. Although the two rooms were adjacent to one another, there was no connecting door and the students had to go into the regular school corridor to get from one room to another. Although attempts were made to establish an informal lounge area it was less successful in the 9-10 program than had been the case in the 11-12 program sinply because there was no special place for it. An area was partitioned off but those in the lounge could easily hear what was going on in the classroom and vice-versa. Early in the year the basis skills laboratory was cluttered with unwanted desks and other materials and the design was still not accommodative to the special needs of the students who were being served by the program. In the 9-10 program the basic skills lab

had been well equipped with carrels, but other desks and tables were more appropriate to a science laboratory than for meeting the "I" Team needs. Students in the program complained that it was too much of a temptation for them to drift back to their regular school companions or to cut classes more frequently than they would like because of the proximity of the program to other parts of the traditional school. Although it was an attempt to establish an "I" Team in the traditional school plant, there seems little doubt that the location of the 9-10 program was far less advantageous than the location of the 11-12 program.

There were nineteen (19) different field experiences for the 9-10 group in which they visited museums, went bowling, toured various parts of Denver comparing sociological conditions, participated in outdoor activities such as skiing, tubing and picnicing, attended certain movies, visited an arts festival, went to Morton News Company where they selected their own paperback library, and attended the "Career Carousel" to learn more about various vocations.

Seventeen (17) students in the 9-10 program were employed in diversified occupations, and nine worked in non-paid activities such as student assistants or overhauling and restoring a car. Among the paid jobs were restaurant work such as bussing, kitchen

work, waiting on tables, and counter work; construction jobs such as painting, installing sheet metal and general construction; as well as miscellaneous jobs such as truck loading, retail sales, sod-laying and landscaping, baby-sitting, caddying, scuba diving instruction, and odd jobs.

In the 11-12 "I" Team, a total of seventy (70) different students were involved in 110 different job situations in the course of the year. Seventy-two (72) students were involved in four major field experiences of three days or more, and 36 one-day experiences. The major field experiences included LaForet, Goose Creek camp-out, Mesa Verde, and Green River Raft Trip. The one day experiences included skiing, plays at Bonfils Theatre, certain movies, art museums, Denver County Jail, Head Start Christmas party, Career Carousel, a trip to Morton News to select a paperback library, and "Seek-Out" (an alternatives in education conference).

The types of work experience included agriculture (3 students), food service (21 students), retail sales (18 students), construction (23 students), automotive and mechanical (17 students), secretarial and office work (7 students), cosmetology (2 students), school aid (7 students), and child care (2 students). Twenty-seven students held the same job all year.

The parents and the community seemed to be highly supportive of the "I" Team Project. Open house was well attended by parents

and interested outsiders. The attempts to provide career education opportunities for students in the "I" Team were well received by the community and a number of businesses were highly cooperative in placing students in various work experiences.

D. Budget

The budget was sufficient to handle the program as it was originally envisioned. Lack of funds has not handicapped the program. One facet of the "I" Team Project which affected the budget was the use of incentive or "bonus" pay for certain staff members. Bonuses are to be paid on the basis of attainment of the objectives for student progress. The incentive pay plan seemed to be well received by the staff and the administration. As evaluators it was interesting to note that some members of the "I" Team staff approved of the use of incentive pay because they felt it was a means of justifying the large number of hours spent in evening rap sessions, field experience trips, and other situations which might be classified as above and beyond the call of duty for a regular classroom teacher. In essence, they agree with the granting of bonus pay as just compensation rather than as extraordinary pay for accomplishment of the objectives of the Project as a whole or the accomplishment of Project objectives for which their position might be primarily responsible.

There seems little reason to suggest budgetary changes since the present budget seems ample to get the job done. A budget summary is contained in the Appendix.

IV. EVALUATION

A. Objectives

The Continuation Proposal for the 1971-72 School Year stated one general objective and fourteen specific objectives of the "I" Team Project. The general objective was stated as follows:

> General Objective: To provide a more meaningful, responsive educational program for a group of educationally handicapped students who do not presently respond to the secondary educational program available to them and, as a result, have essentially "dropped out".

Specifically, the following teacher objectives are sought from this program by the completion of the third year of operation:

1. Teachers involved with the program will build a model of curriculum development for interdisciplinary, student-centered learning experiences for educationally handicapped students. This model will be tested in practice, evaluated, revised and used as a basis for planning curriculum development activities for future years of operation.

2. Teachers will develop instructional methods and multimedia materials to fit student-oriented learning situations. These methods will be utilized in practice, evaluated, revised and used as a basis for planning curriculum development activities for future years of operation.

3. Teachers will develop prescription and assessment practices.

4. Teachers will provide the student with an environment which will lead to successful educational experiences. This environment will provide the opportunities for increased achievement levels, successful adjustments to school and attitudinal changes toward school and education through program modifications and student centered learning situations.

The following student objectives are sought for this program by the completion of the third year of operation:

1. The student will demonstrate an average increase in his reading ability by a minimum of one year as indicated on a pre- and post-standardized achievement test.

2. The student will demonstrate an increase in math skills by a minimum of one year on a pre- and post-standardized math test.

3. The student will participate in field experiences including paid and non-paid work and volunteer services.

4. The student will complete minicourse contracts which have been mutually agreed upon by teacher and student. Credit will be given upon satisfactory course completion and filing of teacher evaluation forms.

5. The student will reflect a more favorable attitude toward himself as an achiever.

6. The student will attempt new activities, even those at which he may fail.

7. The student will report a more positive attitude toward school and school activities.

8. The student will demonstrate an understanding of the application of a study skills formula.

9. Students will be more involved with the development of the vehicles (instructional situations) through which they learn (student-centered approach to learning).

10. Students will develop social awareness in the community through related school and community service participation.

In summary, the primary objectives of the Project are to create positive changes in attitudes, behaviors, and skills of the educationally handicapped students in the program. In addition, there are three "fringe benefit" objectives of the program:

1. the development of model curricular programs;
2. the development of instructional methods and materials;
3. the development of a pattern for prescriptive instruction.

An unstated objective of the program has been to ascertain the affectiveness of the use of a modified performance contract in the "I" Team Project. As previously mentioned the instructional staff in the program worked under an incentive pay plan in which they will be paid a bonus if it is judged that the students have made sufficient gains in areas in which the instructors have responsibility.

B. Choosing Participants

Candidacy for participation may originate with teachers, counselors, administrators, the student involved, or other "I" Team members. If the counselor does not initiate the referral, the student's counselor is informed of candidacy. All referrals are submitted to the Project Director for evaluation and submission to the "I" Project Advisory Committee.

The "I" Project Advisory Committee consists of the school principal, the project director, an "I" Team teacher, a psychologist and a school counselor. The Advisory Committee determines the admission or rejection of the student into the Project. The decision of the Committee is handled by the Project Director.

Students selected for participation were each interviewed. The interview had two purposes: 1) to inform the candidate of the objectives of the "I" Team program and its method of operation, and 2) to enable the staff to ascertain whether or not the candidate was willing to accept the responsibilities necessary in becoming an "I" Team student. These responsibilities included the necessity for maintaining attendance and effort. No student was forced into "I" Team, although it might be pointed out that other alternate routes were usually difficult to find. Many students came into "I" Team with the feeling that this was

their "last chance", a sentiment frequently expressed to the staff and to the evaluators. A capacity of 50 students for the 11-12 "I" Team and 30 for the 9-10 program was the aim throughout the 1971-72 school year. Eighteen senior students graduated at the semester from the 11-12 program. Five students returned to regular classes from the 9-10 program at the semester. These vacancies were filled and a total of 109 students participated in the program this year.

C. Describing Participants

Approximately thirty (30%) percent of the population was girls; seventy (70%) percent was boys. Two kinds of educationally handicapped students were included in the participant population. Some students seemed to have severe skill deficits resulting from presumed perceptual or neurological dysfunction. The second group of students seemed to have difficulty with school primarily because of emotional maladjustment.

Unacceptable social behavior was most notable during the first couple of months during the Fall. In both the 9-10 and 11-12 "I" Team Projects, there was division and antipathy between the "cowboys", the "long hairs", and the "straights". The three groups of students did not trust nor tend to associate with one another.

Members of the 11-12 "I" Team group had an advantage since many of the students had been in the "I" Team the previous year, and barriers were much more easily erased or reduced at the cottage than they were at the East building on campus where the 9-10 students wrestled with the problem of getting along with people who were "different".

Anti-social behavior also evidenced itself in both learning labs with students frequently unable to bear the near rigor of personal application to the mastery of basic skills. They not infrequently would "pop off" at the teacher or prescription specialist and sometimes get up and stalk out of the lab. In the 9-10 program the destruction of school property was particularly prevalent and annoying. Since the two teachers and aide were all new to the situation, there was certainly as much learning going on on the part of the staff as the students. At one point in the 9-10 Project it seemed unlikely that rapport would ever be established between a sizable number of the students and the field experience coordinator. He broke a leg and was seriously handicapped during the latter two-thirds of the year. Later rapport was much improved, however, again in the 9-10 program, ditching was a problem which was never completely eliminated.

Student attitudes and behaviors improved during the course of the year. In the student interviews at the end of the school year, the evaluators found a warm, close, personal relationship existed between the majority of students and one or more teachers. This was particularly true of the 11-12 program, but also existed in many cases at the 9-10 level. A tendency existed for a teacher to relate particularly well to a limited number of students, leaving others out. The prescription specialists avoided this problem particularly well.

An interesting phenomena in the "I" Team was the lack of the development of any strong, positive leadership, despite the efforts of the staff. "I" Team students tended almost wholly to be individualists and as individuals they are often quite remarkable. They seemed to be disinterested in influencing their fellow students in any consistent group effort.

In terms of basic skills some interesting statistics came out in the pre-testing in the Fall of 1971. Six students had the ability to read college level materials. Seven more could read at the senior high school level but the overall average for the 50 students, even averaging in the high scores just mentioned, showed an average instructional level of 7.5, an average lag of approximately 4 years! In fact, 15 of the students tested had instructional reading

levels of third and fourth grade. Even though it's true that some of these students may have done more poorly than they might ordinarily have done due to the test situation, there can be little doubt that such a skill deficit for many of them was a major factor in their frustration with the traditional school system.

In summary, the participants originally often manifested a poor attitude, unacceptable behavior, and generally inadequate basic skills. The change was remarkable.

D. Measuring Changes

Both formal and informal measures of change were included in the project evaluation. In an attempt to measure student attitude two surveys were made. These are included in the Appendix. The first followed the format of a semantic differential test. The second simply allowed the student to mark his attitudes and behaviors on either a yes/no or three point scale such as unchanged, worse, or better. Copies of all measures are included in the Appendix.

Teachers were also asked to evaluate each student on the basis of school performance, self-concept, emotional structure, and interpersonal relationships. This form is also included in the Appendix. Each student was rated on a basis of 1 to 5, with 1 being "outstanding positive change" and 5 being "behavior has become worse".

Parents were asked to evaluate the program and its benefit to their child by checking a response to twelve statements. Additional room was left for comment after each statement and at the end of the questionnaire.

All of these instruments are subject to the standard criticism which may be leveled at pencil and paper measures of attitude and behavior change. It is, however, difficult not to be impressed by the nearly unanimous response to so many of the items. If pencil and paper measures may ever be deemed to give useful evaluation of the program, these do. In determining behavior change, one measure is much more easily quantifiable than the others. This is the attendance record. Although some of the students in the "I" Team have been adept while attending Cherry Creek Senior High School in falsifying attendance records, it seems clear that many of the students were absent more than they were present before joining "I" Team. If any criterion is useful in assessing the effectiveness of a dropout prevention program, attendance ought to be.

The measurement of changes in basic skills is centered on the improvement in reading and math. It was decided to use forms of the Triggs Diagnostic Reading Test, Survey Section, to measure

changes in reading rate, comprehension and vocabulary. An Oscar K. Buros' Reading Test and Reviews, 1968, the Triggs test is reviewed by Fredrick B. Davis, Director of the Test Research Service at Hunter College; William Turnbull, Vice President of Educational Testing Service; and Henry Weitz, Director of the Bureau of Testing and Guidance, Duke University. Dr. Davis deals only with the Diagnostic section leaving out any attention to the Survey Section used in the "I" Team Project. Dr. Turnbull notes that the tests are designed for use over a wide range - grades 7 through 13 inclusive - but he also finds that the normative materials suggests that the tests are reasonably useful even at the two extremes of this wide-spread group. He further notes that the rate in comprehension scores has an indicator reliability coefficient of about .80, the vocabulary score has a reliability of about .85, and the reliability of the total comprehension score about .90. He commends the comprehension sections of the Survey Section, but suggests that the composite score now called "Comprehension" might benefit from being renamed to include emphasis on vocabulary. He says, "In summary, the survey section stands as already one of the better instruments for the evaluation of the overall reading ability".

Dr. Weitz feels that the Survey Section has sufficient average reliability for the total score to permit the use of the test for individual measurement although he urges caution in using isolated subtests. (This was not done by the "I" Team Project) The reliability and validity of the Survey Section of the Diagnostic Reading Test is reported on the second page of the directions for the administration of the test.

Percentile norms are available for grades 7 through 13. These norms were converted to grade equivalency norms for use in calculating reading grade gains. The raw score equivalent to the 50th percentile level was used as the mid-point for each grade. For a very small number of students an upward extrapolation was necessary in order for them to be allowed to receive credit for gains made above the 13th grade level. Extrapolation is a reasonable process assuming continuity of instruction through the levels in which the extrapolation takes place, and given sufficient "head room" so that extrapolation does not tend to crowd the test. In the test in point the extrapolation gives a band of raw scores from 80-87 representing the 14th grade equivalent. This provides 13 points of additional "head room" before the ceiling is reached. Also there is generally accepted continuity in growth and vocabulary

in comprehension throughout the college years, providing the theoretical basis on which the extrapolation must be based. (See Durost, Walter N., and Prescott, George A., Essentials of Measurement of Teachers; Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., New York, 1962, pgs 62-65.)

In addition to the Triggs Test, the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test was used in order to provide a skills profile useful in the 9-10 section. This was used primarily for diagnostic purposes.

In addition to the standardized reading measure, individually administered informal reading inventories were given to determine changes in the student's instructional reading levels. The standardized reading test compares an individual's performance to the performance of others in a normed sample. An Informal Reading Inventory is a criterion measure in which the individual reads a series of selections of increasing, known difficulty which serves as a series of "hurdles". The reader continues to "jump" these hurdles until he arrives at a point where he can no longer leap the hurdle or meet the criteria of 75% comprehension and 95% correct word call. The Informal Reading Inventory which was used was one developed by Dr. Don A. Brown with selections ranging from first grade through college graduate level ranked according to grade level as indicated by the Dale-Chall and Fry Readability Formulae. These

selections were further ranked in terms of difficulty using the Cloze Procedure. Neither rate nor silent reading ability were measured with the Informal Reading Inventory since both of these were included in the Triggs Reading Test.

Changes in the skills of mathematical computation were measured by the Stanford Achievement Test - Math Section. It is a relatively wide range instrument with good standardization both in terms of reliability and validity.

Another general consideration in the selection of the tests for the "I" Team Project was the length of the instrument. In terms of accuracy and reliability, the longer the test the greater the probability of less accurate measurement when dealing with this particular population. In other words, these students would become impatient and therefore fail to do their best on lengthy tests. Therefore, shorter tests were given preference over longer tests. Also, the individually administered "Informal Reading Inventories" were useful in that they provided the check to see that real effort was being applied in the test situation. Since it is more difficult to "fake" in a face to face situation, any student who had purposely tried to do poorly on the group test would be identified as actually capable of better performance when he took the Informal Reading Inventory.

E. Data

In the collection of the data used to analyze the effectiveness of the program in attaining the various objectives, it was found that some of the instruments or measures had a bearing on several different objectives. In this section the specific measures will be briefly described and that data will be reported. In the section on analysis each objective will be analyzed in light of the various data available.

Semantic Differential - This test is a subjective instrument and designed to indicate general attitudinal changes. A copy of the instrument is included in the Appendix. The results of the measure seem to be somewhat ambiguous although the results which rated the teachers in the "I" Project as friendly or unfriendly, tended to give them a strong rating as being friendly. Perhaps the most significant finding was on Item 2 which found a strong change through the year. In October only thirty-five (35%) percent indicated they liked school. In May, almost ninety (90%) percent said they liked school.

Opinions Survey (Attitude Survey) - This instrument seemed to tap more decisive opinions and it was noticed by the evaluators that very similar results were received from both the 9-10 and the

11-12 program. In the first question - "Compared to the regular high school, my attendance during the time I have been in this program is: unchanged, worse, or better", six indicated that it was unchanged, none indicated that it was worse, and the remaining 72 indicated that it was better than it had been before entering the program. On the second item - "My attitude towards school now is: unchanged, worse, or better", five indicated their attitude was unchanged, two indicated that it was worse, and 71 indicated that it was better!

On the third item - "Compared to the regular high school, the amount of things I feel that I have learned since I have been in this program is: about the same, less, or more", nine felt that it was about the same, one felt it was less, and 68 felt it was more. On the fourth item - "The "I" program is: about what I thought it would be, not as good as I thought it would be, better than I thought it would be", 33 indicated that they thought it was about what they thought it would be, eight indicated that it was not as good as they thought it would be, and 36 felt that it was better than they thought it would be.

On the fifth item - "In general, my attitude toward the "I" program is one of: dissatisfaction, satisfaction, or neither", only

two were dissatisfied, nine were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, and 67 marked satisfied. On the sixth item - "I feel better toward myself than I did last year at this time", 64 indicated yes, 12 indicated no, and three indicated a noncommittal attitude.

The seventh item - "Since entering "I" Team I feel more comfortable about accepting new activities", found 67 students marking yes and eight no. The eighth item - "I now feel better about myself as an achiever", 45 yes and 27 no.

On item nine - "I feel that the program should place more emphasis on participation in volunteer community activities" - no strong sentiment seemed to be evidenced with 44 saying yes, 28 saying no, and two indicating a non-committal attitude. On the tenth item - "I feel that the program is too limited and should encourage more participation in classes in the outside community". 41 indicated yes, 33 no. In summary, the instrument indicates a most positive attitude.

Teacher Report - Persons most commonly involved in the teachers' relationship with the students were asked to score the students on school performance, self-concept, emotional structure, and interpersonal relationships. In both the 9-10 and the 11-12 projects, the teachers felt there had been positive change. Teachers varied to some degree in their assessment of change. One teacher commented

"Most of the students have marked improvement in their attitudes. Some of the students have made some startling changes; other students have changed very little or not at all." Another teacher remarked that he felt he had seen miracles performed in the course of the year.

Parent Response - In this instrument the parents proved to be extremely enthusiastic in their support of the "I" Team. In item after item they revealed the strongest support possible for the program and the benefits which their child had received from the program. A copy of all these forms is available in the Appendix.

Attendance Records -

1. The attendance records from the students of the "I" Project were gathered from September 7, 1971, through May 26, 1972. This period of time totaled 174 school days. The mean number of absences for the entire group was 15 with the absentee percentage being 8%. This revealed an attendance record of 92% during the academic year (see Table I).

TABLE I

Attendance Chart for Academic Year 1971-1972; based on 174 days. Students who were in the program the entire year.

Total Number of Absences	Mean Number of Absences	Percentage of Mean Absences	Percentage of Total Attendance Recc
574	15	8%	92%

N=36

2. Attendance records for the same students were computed for the 1970-71 school year at Cherry Creek Senior High School. Based on 180 school days, the mean number of days was 33. This revealed an attendance record of 82% (see Table II).

TABLE II

Attendance Chart for Academic Year 1970-71. Based on 180 days. Students classified as "I" Project students including dropouts and the total number of days absent including the time after they dropped out of school.

Total Number of Absences	Mean Number of Absences	Percentage of Mean Absences	Percentage of Total Attendance Recc
1,891	33	18%	82%

N=54

*10 students were in "I" Project, 1970-71; carried percentage of total attendance record of 96%.

3. Absences totaling 450 days were charged to one group in Table II for those students who dropped out of school during the 1970-71 academic year. If the students had only been charged with absences to their date of dropout, the results would have been those reflected in Table III.

TABLE III

Attendance Chart for Academic Year 1970-71. Based on 180 days. "I" Project students including dropouts who were only charged with absences to their dropout date.

Total Number of Absences	Mean Number of Absences	Percentage of Mean Absences	Percentage of Total Attendance Recor
1,441	26	12	88%

N=54

*10 students were in "I" Project 1970-71; carried percentage of total attendance record of 96%.

4. A comparison was made of the attendance records of those students who were at Cherry Creek Senior High School for the first semester 1971-72 and those who were selected to participate in the "I" Project for the second semester. During the first semester, the mean number of absences for that group was 24, revealing an overall attendance record of 63% for the 15 students. Those students who dropped out of school during the first semester were charged for the total days of absences even though they had been officially dropped from school (see Table IV).

TABLE IV

Attendance Chart for Students at Cherry Creek Senior High School First Semester 1971-72. Based on 90 days.

"I" Project students second semester 1971-72 who were enrolled at Cherr Creek Senior High School first semester and were charged with absences from dropout date.

Total Number of Absences	Mean Number of Absences	Percentage of Mean Absences	Percentage of Total Attendance Recorc
447	24	37	63%

N=15

5. The same group of students in Table IV had a mean of 7 days absent for the second semester, revealing 12% absenteeism or a total attendance figure of 88% (see Table V).

TABLE V

Attendance Chart for Second Semester 1971-72. Based on 84 days. "I" Project students enrolled for second semester only.

Total Number of Absences	Mean Number of Absences	Percentage of Mean Absences	Percentage of Total Attendance Recor
102	7	12	88%

N=15

6. The students in the "I" Project who graduated at the end of first semester 1971-72 maintained a mean number of four absences with 95% attendance during the first semester (see Table VI).

TABLE VI

Attendance Chart for "I" Team Students Who Graduated End of First Semester 1971-72. Based on 90 days.

Total Number of Absences	Mean Number of Absences	Percentage of Mean Absences	Percentage of Total Attendance Recor
72	4	5	95%

N=18

*One student returned to Cherry Creek Senior High School at the end of Fall Semester 1971-72.

7. The same group of students maintained a mean of 11 absences during the 1970-71 school year while at Cherry Creek Senior High School, revealing an attendance percentage of 84% for the entire year (see Table VII).

TABLE VII

Attendance Chart for 1970-71 Academic Year; Students who graduated end of First Semester, 1971-72; Attended Cherry Creek Senior High School during the 1970-71 School Year. Based on 180 days.

Total Number of Absences	Mean Number of Absences	Percentage of Mean Absences	Percentage of Total Attendance Recor
163	11	16	84%

N=15

8. The attendance records from the students in grades 9-10 of the "I" Project were gathered from September 7, 1971, through June 2, 1972. This period of time totaled 174 school days. The mean number of absences for the entire 9-10 group was 9 with the absentee percentage being 5%. This revealed an attendance record of 95% during the academic year (see Table VIII).

TABLE VIII

Attendance Chart for Grades 9-10 based upon the Academic Year 1971-72. Total number of days is 178. Students who were in the program the entire year.

Total Number of Absences	Mean Number of Absences	Percentage of Mean Absences	Percentage of Total Attendance Recor
254	9	5	95%

N=29

9. Attendance records for the same students (grades 9-10) were computed for the 1970-71 school year, previous to their enrollment in the "I" Project. The mean number of days absent was 23. Based on 180 school days, this revealed an attendance record of 87% (see Table IX).

TABLE IX (Grades 9-10)

Attendance Chart for Academic Year 1970-71. Based on 180 days. Students classified as "I" Project students including dropouts and the total days absent including the time after they dropped out of school.

Total Number of Absences	Mean Number of Absences	Percentage of Mean Absences	Percentage of Total Attendance Record
667	23	13%	87%

N=29

Reading Test Results - The instructional reading level change as determined by pre-test, mid-year, and post-test administrations of an informal reading inventory was used as the major measure of reading gain (or loss). A standardized measure had been included at the beginning of the year, but the mid-year evaluation showed that it provided insufficient "head room" to measure the gains being made. Therefore, the Triggs Diagnostic Reading Test, Survey Section, was administered at mid-year (in addition to the Informal Reading Inventory) and again as a post-test. Thus, the only consistent measure of change throughout the year was the IRI. Triggs gain scores were available for the last half of the year only.

On the basis of the IRI, the 62 students tested who had been in the program all year and who had taken both tests showed a mean gain of 2.40 reading grade equivalence. An additional group of 20 students who tested after only one semester in "I" Team showed a mean gain of 3.10 grade equivalence. This corresponds rather closely to the

gains indicated during the second semester by the Triggs test which showed a mean gain of 2.94.

The math section of the Stanford Achievement Test was used to measure changes in arithmetic achievement. Students were only required to take mathematics if initial testing showed them to be below the level of algebra. Furthermore, if they made sufficient progress, they were allowed to drop math after one semester. Pre- and post-test differences on the SAT-M indicated an overall gain of 1.47, with gains of 1.41 grade equivalence registered by the 9-10 group, and 1.52 by the 11-12 group.

The results of the reading and math testing showing year-long gains of 2.4 and 1.5 grade equivalence were high enough to cause the evaluators to look beyond the tests to the students. Some of the students indicated that they were uneasy during the pre-test administration, with two students saying they were so scared they "could not remember anything". This may account in part for the large gains, but it seems completely inescapable that "something good is going on" in the "I" Team Project. Highly significant gains <u>are</u> being made, gains which are impossible to explain any way other than by achievement by the students.

F. Analysis of the Data

In this section, each of the objectives will be reviewed in light of the data. The general objective will be examined last, since the accomplishment of the specific objectives will indicate whether or not it has been achieved.

The first four are specific teacher objectives:

1. Teachers involved with the program will build a model of curriculum development for interdisciplinary, student-centered learning experiences for educationally handicapped students. This model will be tested in practice, evaluated, revised, and used as a basis for planning curriculum development activities for future years of operation.

It seems obvious to the evaluators that such a model has been produced. In interviews with the superintendent and others in the District's central administration, it was revealed that 1) the model would be used next year in a continuation of the present project, and 2) a modification of the model is being considered for extensive use in future years in the new high school.

2. Teachers will develop instructional methods and multi-media materials to fit student-oriented learning situations. These methods will be utilized in practice, evaluated, revised, and used as a basis for planning curriculum development activities for future years of operation.

This objective has been achieved with the development of a number of materials fitted into an individualized instructional method or approach combined with extensive use of minicourses. The

evaluators were impressed with the absence of a "head-jamming" approach to education. There tended to be more emphasis on higher cognitive learning than often is the case in secondary classes. Less attention was given to memorization of facts and correspondingly more attention was given to understanding underlying rationales, causation, etc. This may be partially due to the fact that the students in the "I" Team are less tolerant of such an approach, but it is also part of the consciously recognized aim of the staff.

3. Teachers will develop prescription and assessment practices.

This has clearly been done. There is need for a broadening of the prescriptive and assessment base to include more teachers than just prescription specialist, but, in both the 9-10 and 11-12 projects, assessment and prescription is the heart of the basic skills lab.

4. Teachers will provide the student with an environment which will lead to successful educational experiences. This environment will provide the opportunities for increased achievement levels, successful adjustments to school and attitudinal changes toward school and education through program modifications and student-centered learning situations.

This particular objective was most carefully examined by the evaluators since the final ESEA Title III Report, while apologizing for the brevity of their visit (school had been closed due to heavy

snow) commented, "...one of the weaknesses of the project still appears to be that very little is done to insure that (student-teacher and student-student) interaction is on a meaningful or constructive level". They continue by observing "Students who have been alienated from school...need a vehicle through which they can explore their relationships with others and the world in a manner designed to improve their relationships".

In the same report, however, the team states, "The relationships among the staff, among the students, and between the staff and students were very friendly, cooperative and warm. It was quite a contrast to what one observes in the usual school setting. Hierarchy and authoritarian relationships seem non-existant. The students and teachers treated each other as equals who had different roles and the respect shown was mutual and at a high level.". They later note, "The students are highly supportive of the project and credit it with their being in school in many cases. Thus, student support and acclaim for the project are evident in considerable quantity.", and "There is considerable evidence that students have benefited academically and socially from the project.". Again, later they add, "The project staff must certainly be considered one of its strengths. They are well

trained, enthusiastic, and able to relate well to the type of students the project was designed for.",and "The positive regard in which the project is held by the students, teachers, and the high school principal is a definite asset."

In the Attitudinal Survey in which students returned unsigned estimates of attitudinal change, the students seemed to speak directly to the point raised when 71 of 78 indicated their attitude toward school was better. In addition, 67 of 75 felt more comfortable about attempting new activities, and 64 of 75 said they felt better about themselves as achievers.

The test results in reading and math also tend to indicate that the "I" Team staff has been able to "provide the student with an environment which will lead to successful educational experiences". With mean gains of 2.4 (reading), and 1.5 (math) it is likely these students have made greater gains and have had more success during this past year than at any other time in their academic lives -- at least in those two areas!

Finally, the evaluators, who have visited the program numerous times, feel that, more than being adequate, the "I" Team has achieved this objective in the highest, most commendable fashion. It is true that it is more difficult to measure in objective terms, but all indicators are interpreted by these evaluators to support the position

that the project has done an outstanding job in providing "a vehicle through which they can explore their relationships with others" and improve those relationships.

The following student objectives were stated for the program:

1. The student will demonstrate an average increase in his reading ability by a minimum of one year as indicated on a pre- and post-standardized achievement test.

This was exceeded, with an average increase of 2.4 grade equivalence. Eighty-seven (87%) percent made increases of one year or more.

2. The student will demonstrate an increase in math skills by a minimum of one year on a pre- and post-standardized math test.

This objective was met and surpassed, with a mean grade gain of 1.5 years. Seventy-three (73%) percent of the students made a gain of one year or more.

3. The student will participate in field experiences including paid and nonpaid work and volunteer services.

All students were involved in field experiences of one kind or another. Most students (70 at the 11-12 level and 26 at the 9-10 level) also worked at either paid or nonpaid activities. This objective was met.

4. The student will complete minicourse contracts which have been mutually agreed upon by teacher and student. Credit will be given upon satisfactory course completion and filing of teacher evaluation forms.

Mini courses and the contract system were utilized jointly and extensively. Credit was granted as stated. This objective was met.

5. The student will reflect a more favorable attitude toward himself as an achiever.

The Attitude Survey indicates 64 of 75 felt better toward themselves, three unchanged and the remainder worse toward themselves. This is a reported improvement by 85% of the students sampled. This would not conflict with other reported observations. This objective has been met.

6. The student will attempt new activities, even those at which he may fail.

Again, the Attitude Survey found 67 of 75 reporting that they felt more comfortable attempting new activities. This represents 89% and would indicate achievement of this objective.

7. The student will report a more positive attitude toward school and school activities.

Ninety-one (91%) percent of 78 students responding to an item on the Student Attitude Survey, indicated they had a more positive attitude toward school and school activities. This objective has been met.

8. The student will demonstrate an understanding of the application of a study habit formula.

Some students interviewed by the evaluators evidenced understanding of the SQ3R Reading-Study Formula. Others gave indication of a somewhat more organized approach to studying, often aided by the advice and help given in the Basic Skills Laboratory by the Prescription Specialist. In general, however, it seems unlikely that this objective has been achieved. The students tend not to be well aware of, nor practicing a systematic study approach.

9. Students will be more involved with the development of the vehicles (instructional situations) through which they learn (student-centered approach to learning).

Both through contracts and the informal instructional settings it appears that students are involved in planning. A list of suggestions for various areas of instruction students have suggested was seen by the evaluators. This should be maintained and strengthened, but the evaluators feel this objective has been achieved.

10. Students will develop social awareness in the community through related school and community service participation.

This objective is very difficult to measure. Opportunities have been given for exploration of the greater community and for community service participation. The staff supports gains in this area. Questions on a survey which plumbed the interest of the students in this area, however, received mixed results with only slightly more suggesting

more community involvement. The phrasing of the item tended to cast a negative light on "I" Team ("I feel the program is too limited and should encourage more participation in classes in the outer community and/or in volunteer community activities."). The strong feelings of loyalty may have caused some students to say anything mildly condemnatory of the project. Some growth has been made. The evaluators feel the objective has been met, but may need to be strengthened and evaluated more closely in the future.

> General Objective: To provide a more meaningful, responsive educational program for a group of educationally handicapped students who do not presently respond to the secondary educational program available to them and, as a result, have essentially "dropped out".

This general objective has certainly been met in a most satisfactory fashion.

An unstated objective of the program has been the trial of an incentive pay plan. The evaluators have attempted to assess whether or not each of the staff members have performed well enough in their respective areas to win the incentive bonus contained in their contracts. (Individual contract contents will be kept confidential.) Following are the assessments:

Lyle Johnson, Director - It is agreed by the evaluators that Mr. Johnson has done an excellent job; fulfilling his contract while being called upon by the District to assume additional duties as

Director of Special Education for the District. He has fulfilled the terms of his contract at the cost of considerable additional time and effort. He should receive one hundred (100%) percent of his possible bonus.

Carlos Cuaron, 11-12 Team Leader and Prescription Specialist - Mr. Cuaron is basically responsible for the overall gains in reading and math at the 11-12 level. Both Project goals were met. In terms of individual goals, 89% of the students (9% more than necessary) made a gain of a year or more in reading, but only 78% made their goal in math. In all other respects, however, he achieved excellent results, and the evaluators recommend he receive one hundred (100%) percent of his possible incentive pay.

Bonnie Keck, 9-10 Team Leader and Prescription Specialist - Miss Keck did a superb job as a beginning teacher and the results show in the completion of all requirements for receiving her bonus--again with the exception of the number of students making gains of one year or more in math. Instead of 80%, 67% reached their goal. An unusual situation existed in the 9-10 group, however, with a considerable additional load being assumed by Miss Keck when a supporting team member was partially lost. This directly affected the instructional program in math, and the evaluators felt her performance merit ed their recommendation for one hundred (100%) percent of her possible bonus.

Gordon E. Lee, 9-10 Counselor and Field Experience Coordinator

Mr. Lee had some difficulty adjusting to the unusual sort of program "I" Team required. He was handicapped for two-thirds of the year after a freak motorcycle accident broke his leg and first immobilized him, then confined him to a wheelchair. Although the students engaged in numerous field activities, it was not possible for him to serve them in the fashion envisioned in his contract. The evaluators recommend he be granted eighty (80%) percent of his contract bonus.

Richard Reed, 11-12 Field Experience Director - Mr. Reed fulfilled the goals of his incentive contract. The field experience program was far better operated this year than last. The evaluators feel improvement could be made in records, and interrelationships with the Basic Skills Lab, but this does not reflect lack of appreciation for a job well done. They recommend the award of one hundred (100%) percent of possible bonus pay.

Jeryl Lee Scannell, 11-12 Counselor - Mrs. Scannell related particularly well to certain students, and the evaluators would hope she could reach even more students in the future years of the project. She achieved the objectives of her contract with the exception of the attainment of 78 rather than 80% of the students in math attaining at least one year gain. Earlier creation of attitudinal measures of change would be helpful, but this suggestion does not indicate that

she did not meet the requirements for the bonus. The evaluators recommend that she be given one hundred (100%) percent of her possible bonus.

The interns in the project performed extremely well, and although there is no obligation to do so, the evaluators recommend that Beth Youngs be given a special bonus for her excellent work, and that each of the others be given some token of appreciation for good work in making the project a success.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The evaluators recommend the following:

1. The Project be continued.

2. The 9-10 "I" Team be relocated.

3. The incentive pay plan be retained, but clarified in such a way that it is understood to be an incentive for achieving the goals of the Project and not as a just reward for "overtime".

4. The present structure ought not to be greatly changed.

5. There should be more integration of the efforts of the teachers: i.e., the Prescription Specialist used to help students with reading or math problems in their field experience, and more lab participation by counselors and field experience directors.

6. "I" Team is worthy of national note. Efforts to share information this year should be continued next year, and a well-presented descriptive brochure or longer publication should be prepared and distributed.

SUMMARY

The "I" Team stands as a proven workable example of an alternate educational program. The evaluators do not pretend to understand all the reasons it works, but they feel strongly that the results are indisputable. It does work. It should be helped to grow and spread as an example to other school districts across the country.

Don A. Brown
Donald E. Carline
Evaluators

APPENDIX

IRI TEST RESULTS

Instructional Levels
May 16, 1972
11-12 "I" Team

STUDENT	1971 Pre	1971 Mid	1972 Post	Total Gain
ARNOLD, JANE	4	6	16	12
ATHERTON, RENEE	8	10	11	3
ATHERTON, TANYA	8	10		(2)
BARTELDES, BILL	8	8		(0)
BISGARD, JILL	6	7	13	(1)
BOONE, TED	8	8		(0)
BOWMAN, LISA		12	13	(1)
BRADSHAW, KEVIN	12	13		(1)
BREDESEN, SCOTT	10	11	12	2
BRUNGARDT, GARY	10	11	11	1
BUCKNER, MARK	10	11	13	3
CHRISTENSON, J.	8	10		(2)
COON, PATTI		8	7	-1
COSTELLO, D.	14	15		(1)
DIXON, DAVE	14	14		0
DUTCHER, KIRK	4	4	4	0
ELLIS, BARBARA	3	4		(1)
ELLISON, RICHARD	4	3	9	5
EYRE, EARL	8	9		(1)
FISCHER, HAROLD	6	7		(1)
FISTELL, DARLENE	5	6	12	7
FLOWERS, DAVE	16	17		(1)
FUHR, KURT		6	10	4
GEILER, M.	4	5		(1)
GILCHRIST, TED	6	7		(1)
GRAHAM, TOM	5	8		(3)
HARRISON, MICHELLE	8	9	12	4
HOLT, CORKY	6	8	14	8
HORDINSKI, E.		9	10	1
HRDLICKA, W.	12	14		(2)
ISAACS, DAVE		11	14	3
JANCEWICZ, N.	6	9		(3)
JOHNSON, S.	8	10		(2)
JOHNSON, N.	8	9		(1)
LAUCK, D.	4	4		(0)

Page Two
IRI Test Results
11-12 "I" Team

STUDENT	1971 Pre	1971 Mid	1972 Post	Total Gain	
LEGER, K.	4	5		(1)	
LOCKE, B.	12	12	13		1
MALMGREN, D.	8	10		(2)	
MANGNALL, JAE ANNE	3		9	(6)	
MARCOVE, D.	4	5		(1)	
MIHALIK, S.	3	4	16	(1)	13
MUROYA, R.		5	9		4
OLIVER, R.	4	5	6	(1)	2
READ, CHRIS	13	14		(1)	
RICHARDSON, B.	3	4	10	(1)	7
ROSSI, G.		11	12		1
SANDAGE, BILL	6	9	16	(13)	10
SANDBERG, C.	4	5	12	(1)	8
SCANNEL, D.	8	8	12	(0)	4
SCHERMERHORN, ROBIN	8	9		(1)	
SCHULTZ, P.	8	9		(1)	
SMITH, G.	14	14		(0)	
TAYLOR, C.	4	4		(0)	
ULLMAN, L.		7	8		1
VICKERS, S.		7	11		4
VOGLER, R.		10	12		2
WAHL, CATHY	3	3	7		4
WEBSTER, DANNY		13	14		1
WILLIAMS, CLAUDE	8	11	12		4
WILLIAMS, GENE		5	7		2
WILSON, J.	12	13		(1)	
WILSON, SCOTT	14	15	16		2

READING TEST RESULTS

Instructional Levels
June 2, 1972
11-12 "I" Team

STUDENT	Stanford Diag. Pre 1971	Triggs Mid 1971	Triggs Post 1972	Total Gain
ARNOLD, JANE	12	15		3
ATHERTON, RENEE	9	11		2
ATHERTON, RONYA	12	11		-1
BARTELDES, BILL	10	13		3
BISGARD, JILL	2??	11		9?
BOONE, TED	7	8		1
BRADSHAW, KEITH	12	13		1
BREDESON, SCOTT	12	13		1
BRUNGARDT, GARY	12	11		-1
BUCKNER, MARK	12	13		1
CHRISTENSON, JEFF	--	8		--
COSTELLO, D.	12	16		4
DIXON, DAVE	11	12		1
DUTCHER, KIRK	6	5		-1
ELLIS, BARB	5	6		1
ELLISON, RICHARD	7	5	9	2
EYRE, EARL	11	13		2
FISHER, HAROLD	3	11		8
FISTELL, DARLENE	4	7	8	4
FLOWERS, DAVE	12	15		3
GEILER, MARK	11	14		3
GILCHRIST, TED	8	9		1
GRAHAM, TOM	12	13		1
HARRISON, SHELLY	7	11		4
HOLT, CORKY	12	10	15	3
HRDLICKA, W.	12	12		0
JANCEWICZ, N.	12	14		2
JOHNSON, SCOTT	9	9		0
JOHNSON, NANCY	7	11	14	7
LAUCK, DEBBIE	12	12		0
LEGER, KEITH	11	11		0
LOCKE, BRAD	12	12		0
MALMGREN, DAVE	12	13		1
MANGNALL, J.	6	7		1

Reading Test Results

STUDENT	Stanford Diag. Pre 1971	Triggs Mid 1971	Triggs Post 1972	Total Gain
MARCOVE, DENISE	--	10		--
MIHALIK, SHERRY	12	14		2
OLIVER, RICK	6	10	11	5
READ, CHRIS	2	9	--	--
RICHARDSON, BETH	6	9		3
SANDAGE, BILL	12	15		3
SANDBERG, CARRIE	8	8	11	0
SCANNEL, DENIS	7	8	8	1
SCHERMERHORN, ROBIN	8	9		1
SCHULTZ, PAT	12	14		2
SMITH, GARY	12	13		1
TAYLOR, CARDELL		Pre10	9	-1
WAHL, CATHY	6	7	9	3
WILLIAMS, CLAUDE	7	12		5
WILSON, JIM	12	14		2
WILSON, SCOTT	12	13		1

(SECOND SEMESTER) STUDENT	Triggs Pre 1972	Triggs Post 1972	Total Gain
APPLEGATE, BOB	8.5	13	4.5
BAILY, FRANK	12		0
BAILY, MONICA	9	12	3
BOWMAN, LISA	12		0
COON, PATTY	8	10.2	2.2
FUHR, KURT	13		0
HORDINSKI, ERIC	14		0
ISAACS, DAVE	15		0
JAHN, CARL	7	10.7	3.7
MUROYA, RICHARD	9	12	3
O'NEIL, SUSAN	13		0
PRATER, TONY	9	11	2
PRATER, DAN	9	13.5	4.5
ROSSI, GINNI	11		0
STEFANSKI, MIKE	8	11.8	3.8
ULLMAN, LEROY	8	14	6
VICKERS, SUSAN	10	13	3
VOGLER, RAY	6	14	8
WEBSTER, DAN	13		0
WILLIAMS, EUGENE	7		0
WOOD, ROBBIE	5	5	0

MATHEMATICS TEST RESULTS

Instructional Levels
June 2, 1972
11-12 "I" Team

STUDENT	1971 Pre	1971 Mid	1972 Post	Total Gain
ARNOLD, JANE	8.9	12.8		3.9
ATHERTON, RENEE	10.6	11.3		.7
ATHERTON, TONYA	8.2	9.7		1.5
BARTELDES, BILL	7.1	10.1		3
BISGARD, JILL	8.6	11.5	12.1	3.5
BOONE, TED	6.3	5.3	7.3	1.1
BRADSHAW, KEITH	11.6	12.3		.7
BREDESON, SCOTT	9.0	10.7		1.7
BRUNGARDT, GARY	4.3	5.8		1.5
BUCKNER, MARK	8.6	11.7		3.1
CHRISTENSON, JEFF	5.0	8.1		3.1
COSTELLO, D.	10.3	10.6		.3
DIXON, DAVE	8.7	10.1		1.4
DUTCHER, KIRK	5.5	5.5		
ELLIS, BARB	6.5	6.1		-.4
ELLISON, RICHARD	6.8	5.0		-1.8
EYRE, EARL	11.1	12.4		1.3
FISHER, HAROLD	6.1	7.6		1.5
FISTELL, DARLENE	5.2	5.3		.1
FLOWERS, DAVE	9.5	12.6		3.1
GEILER, MARK	8.9	10.3		1.4
GILCHRIST, TED	7.2	8.7		1.5
GRAHAM, TOM	10.4			0
HARRISON, SHELLY	9.2	9.7		.5
HOLT, CORKY	10.6	11.3		.7
HRDLICKA, W.	7.4	10.7		1.3
JANCEWICZ, N.	10.6	11.6		1
JOHNSON, SCOTT	6.4	8.4		2
JOHNSON, NANCY	8.2	10	11.6	3.4
LAUCK, DEBBIE	7.0	8.7		1.7
LEGER, KEITH	6.7	8.7	8.8	2.1
LOCKE, BRAD	12	12		0
MALMGREN, DAVE	5.0	6.9	8.0	3
MANGNALL, J.	5.4	--		--
MARCOVE, DENISE	7.1	8.1		1

Mathematics Test Results
Page Two

STUDENT	1971 Pre	1971 Mid	1972 Post	Total Gain
MIHALIK, SHERRY	9.3	12.3		3
OLIVER, RICK	6.4	7.8	8.0	1.6
READ, CHRIS	6.2	4.9	--	--
RICHARDSON, BETH	7.1	8.1	11.2	4.1
SANDAGE, BILL	7.8	9.9	11.9	4.1
SANDBERG, CARRIE	5.8	6.8	7.8	2
SCANNEL, DENIS	7.4	8.5	4.2	--
SCHERMERHORN, ROBIN	6.6	8.5		1.9
SCHULTZ, PAT	8.7	12.1		3.4
SMITH, GARY	8.3	11.1		2.8
TAYLOR, CARDELL	6.4	--		--
WAHL, CATHY	6.8	7.6	9.9	3.1
WILLIAMS, CLAUDE	7.7	8.0		.3
WILSON, JIM	11.4	12.3		.9
WILSON, SCOTT	9.4	10.7		1.3

(SECOND SEMESTER)STUDENT	1-1972 Pre	1972 Post	Total Gain
APPLEGATE, BOB	8.5	9.6	1.1
BAILY, FRANK	12		
BAILY, MONICA	9.7	7.9	-1.8
BOWMAN, LISA	6.8	8.8	2
COON, PATTY	8.0	10.4	2.4
FUHR, KURT	6.6	8.8	2
HORDINSKI, ERIC	7.0	10.5	3.5
ISAACS, DAVE	12.5		0
JAHN, CARL	6.5	8.4	1.9
MUROYA, RICHARD	10.6		0
O'NEIL, SUSAN	10	11.9	1.9
PRATER, TONY	9.3	11.1	1.8
PRATER, DAN	8.1	10.4	2.3
ROSSI, GINNI	5.8?	11.6	?
STEFANSKI, MIKE	11.5		0
ULLMAN, LEROY	5.1	7.0	1.9
VICKERS, SUSAN	7.7	8.6	.9
VOGLER, RAY	8.4	12.7	4.3
WEBSTER, DAN	8.9	9.3	.4
WILLIAMS, EUGENE	6.9	7.0	.1
WOOD, ROBBIE	3.6	5.8	2.2

DIAGNOSTIC MATH SCORES

STUDENT	FALL SATM	SEMESTER SATM	INC.	SPRING SATM	INC.
D. Anderson	5.9	7.5	1.6		
M. Bailey	5.6	6.1	.5		
R. Barnes	new	5			
D. Bluhm	6.4	6.1	-.3		
C. Burnett	4.9	6.1	1.2		
B. Chambers	6.8	6.5	.3	8.1	1.3
D. Crane	6.9	9.9	3		
S. Doell	6.4	11.2	4.8		
P. Fritzler	5.1	5.8	.7		
L. Ellison	new	3.8			
R. Giess	4.8	6.1	1.3	6.4	1.6
S. Gilchrist	5.8	8.5	2.7		
S. Hilliard	6.9	6.7	-.2	7.0	+.1
K. Haynes	new	6.9		8.9	2.0
M. Kerstetter	4.9	7.4	2.5	5.9	1.0
P. Klee	5.3	6.7	1.4	7.4	2.1
M. Lindauer	4.7	5.9	1.2	5.9	--
J. Martinez	9.6	11.4	1.8	12.4	2.8
R. McManigal	5.3			5.6	.3
K. Mihalik	6.4	9.5	3.1		
D. Miller	6.4	8.9	2.5	7.9	1.5
J. Padilla	new	6.5		5.8	-.7
B. Paschall	6.9	8.9	2	8.3	1.4
D. Pazzin	new	10.4			
D. Robinson	6.1	withdrew			
D. Shores	6.6	11.2	4.6		
R. Smedley	5.7	6.7	1		
D. Smith	new	7.9			
B. Snow	6.1	6.9	.8		
M. Tamura	5.2	6.3	1.1		
J. Turnage	4.6	5.4	.8	5.0	.4
F. Turner	5.6	6.4	.8		
A. Vormittag	5.8	5.3	-.5	4.7	-1.1
W. Walker	4.4	6.9	2.5		
D. Wood	new	5.7		6.1	.4

READING TEST SCORES
AVERAGES AND INCREASES

	FALL			SEMESTER				SPRING			
STUDENT	SDRT	IRI	AVE	SDRT	IRI	AVE	INC	SDRT	IRI	AVE	I
Anderson	4.3	3	3.7	5.7	4	4.8	1.1	6.4	5	5.7	
Bailey	6.2	4	5.1	8.2	8	8.1	3.0	9.0	10	9.5	
Barnes	new student			5.0	6	5.5	--	4.8	8	6.4	
Bluhm	9	8	8.5	9.5	8	8.7	.2	12.6	12	12.3	
Burnett	7.5	3	5.3	12.3	5	8.6	3.3	11.6	12	11.8	
Chambers	11.6	4	7.8	10.6	8	9.3	1.5		8		
Crane	6.4	4	5.2	10.1	8	9	2	10.6	12	11.3	
Doell	4.6	5	4.8	11.6	6	8.8	4	transferred			
Fritzler	11.6	6	8.8	10.1	9	9.5	.7	in regular program			
Ellison	new student			6.2	4	5.1	--		5		
Geiss	4.2	5	4.6	7.5	8	7.7	2		12		
Gilchrist	6.9	3	4.9	7.5	8	7.7	2.8	8.5	8	8.3	
Hilliard	10.6	6	8.3	11.1	16	13.5	5.2		16		
Haynes	new student			12.3	10	11.1	--	10.6	16	13.3	
Kerstetter	3.4	4	3.7	5.7	4	4.8	1.1		8		
Klee	3.2	3	3.1	5.7	3	4.3	1.2		4		
Lindauer	9	4	6.5	7.5	5	6.2	-.3		5		
Martinez	10.6	6	8.3	9	10	9.5	1.2		12		
McManigal	2.2	2	2.1	--	--	--	--				
Mihalik	12.3	6	9.1	9	14	11.5	2.4	12.1	14	13.1	
Miller	12.1	8	10	9.5	14	11.7	1.7		14		
Padilla	new student			6	5	5.5	--		8		
Paschall	6.4	3	4.7	8.2	5	6.6	1.9		10		
Pazzin	new student			9.5	14	11.7	--	8.5	14	11.2	
Robinson	7.2	8	7.6	withdrew from school							
Shores	9	10	9.5	11.1	14	12.5	3	12.1	16	14	
Smedley	6.7	5	5.8	7.8	8	7.9	2.1	in regular program			
Smith	new student			11.1			--	out of town			
Snow	5.7	4	4.8	10.1	8	9	4.2	9.5	8	8.8	
Tamura	10.6	10	10.3	6.7	9	7.8	-2.5	in regular program			
Tavenner	5.1	4	4.5	withdrew from the program (moved)							
Turnage	2.7	4.	3.3	3.8	4	3.9	.6		4		
Turner	10.6	6	8.3	11.1	10	10.5		2.2	moved		
Vormittag	4.2	4	4.1	5.5	4.5	5	.9		5		
Walker	7.2	3	5.1	11.1	4	7.5	2.4		8		
Wood	new student			4.5							

ATTITUDE SURVEY

April, 1972

1. Compared to the regular high school, my attendance during the time I have been in this program is:

unchanged	4
worse	0
better	23

Comment: Those who felt their attendance was unchanged attended a highly structured school last year where attendance was mandatory.

2. My attitude toward school now is:

unchanged	2
worse	1
better	24

3. Compared to the regular high school, the amount of things I feel I have learned since I have been in this program is:

same	5
less	1
more	21

4. The "I" Program is:

about what I thought it would be	11
not as good as I thought it would be	4
better than I thought it would be	12

5. In general, my attitude toward the "I" Program is one of:

dissatisfaction	2
satisfaction	21
neither	4

Comment: One who marked dissatisfaction added that he did so due to the fact that he wanted to learn more than we were able to provide classes in.

6. I feel better toward myself than I did last year at this time:

yes	22
no	5

Comment: One student marked both yes and no.

7. Since entering "I" Team, I feel more comfortable about attempting new activities:
   yes 23
   no 3

   Comment: One student marked no change.

8. I now feel better about myself as an achiever:
   yes 21
   no 7

   Comment: Two students marked both yes and no.

9. I feel the program should place more emphasis on participation in volunteer community activities:
   yes 20
   no 8

10. I feel the program is too limited and should encourage more participation in classes in the outside community:
   yes 17
   no 11

51 Returned

Student's Name

Date April 1972

PLACE AN "X" AFTER THE STATEMENT THAT MOST CORRECTLY EXPRESSES YOUR OPINION:

1. Compared to the regular high school, my attendance during the time I have been in this program is:

   unchanged 2
   worse
   better 49

2. My attitude toward school now is:

   unchanged 3
   worse 1
   better 47

3. Compared to the regular high school, the amount of things I feel I have learned since I have been in this program is:

   about the same 4
   less
   more 47

4. The "I" Program is:

   about what I thought it would be 22
   not as good as I thought it would be 4
   better than I thought it would be 24

5. In general, my attitude toward the "I" Program is one of:

   dissatisfaction
   satisfaction 46
   neither 5

6. I feel better toward myself than I did last year at this time:

   yes 42
   no 7
   yes/no 2

7. Since entering "I" Team, I feel more comfortable about attempting new activi

   yes 44
   no 5

8. I now feel better about myself as an achiever.

   yes 43
   no 4
   yes/no 1

9. I feel that the program should place more emphsis on participation in volunte community activities:

   yes 24
   no 20
   yes/no 2

10. I feel that the program is too limited and should encourage more participatio in classes in the outside community:

   yes 24
   no 22

_____ -- _____

Student's Name Date Evaluated

Months in Program _____

This check list has been devised as a means of identifying behavioral changes in a student through observation. If a student, when placed in the program, had a particular difficulty, place a check mark (x) before the descriptive word or phrase. Place a number indiciating the kind of change observed in the student in the space provided after the descriptive word or phrase. The following indicates the degree of change you feel has occurred.

1 _____ Outstanding positive change
2 _____ Above average positive change
3 _____ Slight positive change
4 _____ No change
5 _____ Behavior has become worse

School Performance

_____ ability to express himself when talking to others _____;
_____ completes assignments on time _____;
_____ ability to understand and follow verbal instructions _____;
_____ ability to understand and follow written instructions _____;
_____ attends class regularly _____;
_____ ability to work independently _____.

Self Concept

_____ participates willingly in classroom projects _____;
_____ is overly self critical _____;
_____ lacks confidence _____;
_____ self centered (egocentric _____
_____ overly dependent _____.

Emotional Structure

_____ hyperactive _____;
_____ daydreams excessively _____;
_____ overly shy and withdrawing _____;
_____ physically agressive _____;
_____ moody _____;
_____ easily frustrated _____;
_____ disruptive in the classroom _____;
_____ short attention span _____;
_____ distractible _____;
_____ verbally aggressive _____;
_____ fearful _____.

Interpersonal Relationships

_____ seeks attention from the teachers _____;
_____ resists authority _____;
_____ uncooperative _____;
_____ picks on other students _____;
_____ authoritarian _____;
_____ overly suggestible _____;
_____ has difficulty making friends _____;
_____ disrespectful to teachers _____

Please add any additional comments in the space below:

_____

_____

_____

_____

Evaluator

Cherry Creek Senior High School
Englewood, Colorado

"I" PROGRAM PARENT RESPONSE
1972

Check the MOST APPROPRIATE statement:

Example: I like apples

x a. Yes
_____ b. No
_____ c. No opinion

1. Do you feel the "I" program has met your child's needs during this school year?
   _____ a. A great deal
   _____ b. Beneficial but not to a great extent
   _____ c. Adequate
   _____ d. Inadequate
   Comment: _____

2. Which best describes the effect of the "I" program on your child?
   _____ a. Positive effe ct on child
   _____ b. Not much difference than regular school
   _____ c. Negative effect on child
   Comment: _____

3. If the opportunity presented itself would you consider letting your boy girl volunteer or be referred again for the "I" program?
   _____ a. Definitely
   _____ b. Perhaps
   _____ c. No
   _____ d. No opinion
   Comment: _____

4. Have you seen a positive change of attitude toward school in your child this year?
   _____ a. Yes
   _____ b. No
   _____ c. No opinion
   Comments: _____

Parent Response

5. Have you seen a positive change of interest in school in your child this year?

_____ a. Yes
_____ b. No
_____ c. No opinion
Comments: _____
_____

6. In your opinion how does the "I" program rate overall?

_____ a. Excellent
_____ b. Satisfactory
_____ c. Fair
_____ d. Poor
_____ e. No opinion
Comments: _____
_____

7. In your opinion, how would your child rate the program?

_____ a. Excellent
_____ b. Satisfactory
_____ c. Fair
_____ d. Poor
_____ e. No comment
Comments: _____
_____

8. In your opinion, what is the most successful part of the program?
Rate 1, 2, 3

_____ a. Laboratory (reading & math)
_____ b. Counseling (individual help)
_____ c. Field Experiences) camp-outs, field trips)
_____ d. Mini classes
_____ e. Work experiences
Comments: _____
_____

9. In your opinion, what is the least successful part of the program?
Rate 1, 2, 3

_____ a. Laboratory
_____ b. Counseling
_____ c. Field Experiences
_____ d. Mini Classes
_____ e. Work Experiences
Comments: _____
_____

10. Do you feel your child has benefited from being in the "I" program?

_____ a. Yes
_____ b. Somewhat
_____ c. Not as much as regular school
_____ d. Very little
_____ e. No

Comment: _____
_____

11. Do you feel that field experiences (field trips) and community involvement are beneficial learning experiences for your child?

_____ a. Yes
_____ b. No
_____ c. No opinion
_____ d. Child did not take part

Comments: _____
_____

12. Please comment on the program and give any suggestions that you have for the staff to consider which you feel would improve the program.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

WORK EXPERIENCES '71-'72

APPLEGATE, BOB	Country Fair Gardens Center
ARNOLD, JANE	Patterson, Muffley & Penner Denver Boulevard Drumstick Miller Stockmen
ATHERTON, RENEE	Alan Ever Co. Enco Car Wash
BAILEY, FRANK	Arapahoe Enco Air Denver Inc. Interstate Construction Co.
BAILEY, MONICA	Bon Ton Beauty School
BARTELDES, BILL	Barteldes Ramsey Barteldes G.M.C. Properties
BISGARD, JILL	Laurel I nteriors Leher's Flowers Morrow's Nut House
BOONE, TED	G.M.C. Properties
BOWMAN, LISA	Cherry Creek West
BREDESEN, SCOTT	Newport Investments West Jr. High
BRUNGARDT, GARY	Colorado Diving Supply Newport Investments
BUCKNER, MARK	The Pub Denver University
COON, PATTIE	Mr. Steak
DIXON, DAVE	Holly South Newport Investment
DUTCHER, KIRK	
ELLIS, BARBARA	Kings Food Host Wa lgreens
ELLISON, RICHARD	Conoco Car Clinic Newport Investments

Work Experiences

EYRE, EARL	Round The Corner
FISTELL, DARLENE	Country Dinner Playhouse
FLOWERS, DAVID	Schlessman YMCA Guthries Construction Stan & Ollies
FUHR, KURT	Havana Inn
GRAHAM, TOM	Airport '66'
HARRISON, MICHELLE	Pet City
HOLT, CORKY	Horticulture Colorado Divers Supply G.M.C. Construction Student Assistant
HORDINSKI, ERIC	Hutsan Industries Inc. Phillips '66'
ISAACS, DAVID	Piling Construction Co.
JAHN, CARL	Havana Inn
JOHNSON, NANCY	Cherry Creek High School Cloth World
LOCKE, BRAD	Fruend Plumbing & Heating Southmoor Inn Hungry Dutchman Black Forest Greenhouse
MANGNALL, JAEANNE	
MIHALIK, SHERRY	Cherry Creek Cottage
MURCYA, RICHARD	Red Angus
OLIVER, RICK	Cherry Creek Cottage
O'NEIL, SUSAN	Holberg Rose Farm
PRATER, DANIEL	John Jay Agency
PRATER, TONY	John Jay Agency

Work Experiences

READ, CHRIS	A & W Root Beer Drive-In Evergreen Half Acre
RICHARDSON, BETH	Housekeeper & Child care Pie Pantry
ROSSI, VIRGINIA	Bon Ton Beauty School
SANDAGE, WILLIAM	Colorado Outward Bound School Pandora's Inc.
SANDBERG, CARRIE	Cherry Creek Senior High Cherry Creek Cottage
SCANNELL, DENNIS	Tenneco Oil Co.
SMITH, GARY	Plaza Deli
STEFANSKI, MIKE	Cherry Creek Inn
TAYLOR, CARDELL	Mile High Building Co.
ULLMAN, LeROY	Poster Machine Co.
VICKERS, SUSAN	Babysitting and child care
VOGLER, RAY	Stan & Ollies
WAHL, CATHRINE	"I" Team Cottage Office Assistant
WEBSTER, DAN	Cherry Creek Inn
CLAUDE WILLIAMS	Holly Hills Elementary School
EUGENE WILLIAMS	Goodro Ford
WILSON, SCOTT	Gigantic Cleaners
WOOD, ROBBIE	

CHERRY CREEK HIGH SCHOOL
"I" PROJECT
STUDENT ATTITUDE SURVEY
1971-72

The following are statements of opposites. Circle the letter that best describes your feelings in regard to these:

EXAMPLE:

A. I am a creep. A B (C) D E People like me very well.

(This example shows that I think I am NEITHER a creep nor neat; I am average.)

1.	People like me pretty well.	A	B	C	D	E	People don't like me very well.
2.	I hate school.	A	B	C	D	E	I like school.
3.	I think I'm dumb.	A	B	C	D	E	I think I'm smart.
4.	I do the best I can in school.	A	B	C	D	E	I don't care how well I do in school.
5.	It is hard for me to make friends.	A	B	C	D	E	It is easy for me to make friends.
6.	I wish I could do better in school.	A	B	C	D	E	I don't care how I do in school.
7.	I never do anything right.	A	B	C	D	E	I never do anything wrong.
8.	I plan to go to college.	A	B	C	D	E	I do not plan to go to college.
9.	My teachers in regular school are unfriendly.	A	B	C	D	E	My teachers in regular school are friendly.
10.	My teachers in the "I" Project are unfriendly.	A	B	C	D	E	My teachers in the "I" Project are friendly.
11.	I don't like to miss school.	A	B	C	D	E	I like to miss school.

12.	I am proud.	A	B	C	D	E	I am ashamed.
13.	I don't know what I want to be.	A	B	C	D	E	I know what I want to be.
14.	I enjoy being with other kids at school.	A	B	C	D	E	I don't enjoy being with other kids at school.
15.	School is interesting.	A	B	C	D	E	School is a bore.
16.	I am happy.	A	B	C	D	E	I am unhappy.
17.	It is important for me to be successful in what I do.	A	B	C	D	E	It is unimportant for me to be successful in what I do.
18.	I dislike most of my teachers.	A	B	C	D	E	I like most of my teachers.
19.	I can do well in school.	A	B	C	D	E	I cannot do well in school.
20.	I am likable.	A	B	C	D	E	I am unlikable.
21.	I am phoney.	A	B	C	D	E	I am real.
22.	I am ambitious.	A	B	C	D	E	I am lazy.

PROPOSED BUDGET SUMMARY/EXPENDITURE REPORT OF FEDERAL FUNDS

NAME AND ADDRESS OF AGENCY
Cherry Creek School District (Arapahoe No. 5)
4700 South Yosemite Street, Englewood, Colorado 80110

GRANT NUMBER
0029

BUDGET PERIOD(Mo/Day/Year)
Beg: 7/1/71 End: 6/30/72

FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION	Acct. No.	Profes-sional	Nonpro-fessional	Employee Benefits	Supplies/ Materials	Contrac-ted Svcs.	Travel	Capital Outlay	Other Exp.	Expendi-tures	Ne Bu
ADMINISTRATION	100	4,150.			1,056.				964.	6,170.	
INSTRUCTION	200	24,364.	3,000.		1,458.	4,000.	1,200.		3,120	37,142.	
ATTENDANCE - PUPIL SERVICES	300										
HEALTH SERVICES	400										
PUPIL TRANSPOR-TATION SVCS.	500						2,500.			2,500.	
OPERATION OF PLANT	600					480.				480.	
MAINTENANCE OF PLANT	700										
FIXED CHARGES	800								6,710.	6,710.	
FOOD SERVICES	900										
STUDENT BODY ACTIVITIES	1000										
COMMUNITY SERVICES	1100										
Remodeling(If costs totaling more than $2,000. enter in Part II	1200										
CAPITAL OUTLAY (Equipment only)	1230								166.	166.	
PAYMENTS TO CTHER DISTRICTS	1600										

TOTAL EXPENDITURES $53,168.00